

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

09/872,421

Applicant(s)

MOHRI ET AL.

Examiner

Marianne L. Padgett

Art Unit

1762

All Participants:

(1) Marianne L. Padgett.

(2) Jeffrey Schmidt.

Status of Application: RCE

(3) Tim Cremen.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 24 April 2004

Time: various

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

N/A

Claims discussed:

4-6 & 13-15

Prior art documents discussed:

N/A

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Messages were exchanged between the examiner & Mr. Schmidt, but he was going out of the country on Friday, so Mr. Cremen resolved some informational problems, but any changes to claims needed to wait for Mr. Schmidt. It was noted that the cited support in the remarks for the 9/02/04 amendment did not match that of what appears to be the original specification in the scanned file. The PTO file copy appears to be slightly more compressed than applicants', such that support for the chalk limitation is found on p. 21, lines 5-10. With respect to claims 4-6 & 13-15, it was noted that "interpolated" in lines 2, was nonidiomatic phrasing, but would appear to be consistent with --input--. The Examiner noted that claims needed method limitations therein rephrased to necessitate device structure. .